

in the senate when they came within a few votes of expelling a man who admitted that he expended nearly eleven times as much as any senator can spend hereafter.

We are moving, my friends, and the democratic party is leading the way; and we have just started on this publicity doctrine. We are not only going farther but we are already making progress. A few months ago we said we ought to know on whose recommendation the president appointed judges and he answered with indignation that it was a reflection on him and the court. Well, there have been so many reflections on him that he can not afford to get indignant every time—it might become chronic. Already a bill has passed through the house asking the president to make public hereafter the recommendations, verbal and written, upon which he appoints judges, and only thirteen democrats voted against it when it passed. I hope it will pass the senate at this session. If it does not pass now it will before long, for the American people will not much longer permit the president to retire to the dark room of the White house and develop judicial negatives; he will be asked to step forth into the light.

And we have another matter before congress, a bill already introduced, compelling presidential candidates and those who support them to make known the sources of campaign contributions, and I will venture the assertion that neither one of the candidates at this table (Wilson and Gaynor) will object to this kind of a law. I do not want to slight anybody. If there are any other candidates will they speak up? Why draw the line at a convention? Why require publicity as to contributions made AFTER a nomination and cover with a veil of secrecy the contributions made to secure a nomination, contributions that might put the candidate under obligation to interests that would prevent the faithful performance of public duty? Here is a reform that is coming; it is in line with what we have had. And still another reform is coming, although possibly I ought to have waited until I got out of town before I mentioned it. It is publicity as to the ownership of newspapers. (Applause.) The newspaper has been a dark lantern, throwing light in front but concealing the man who held the lantern. A newspaper lives on publicity. No individual has a home too sacred for the newspaper to invade. No life can escape the scanning of the newspaper. Why not let the people know who owns them? There is no greater menace to our politics today or to good government, than the fact that predatory interests not only can own, but do own, newspapers; they employ brilliant editors to chloroform their readers while the owners pick the pockets of their readers. Who will defend a system under which a man can assassinate every public man who tries to protect the people and flatter every base betrayal of public trust? When I see what the democratic party has had to contend against, I am amazed that it has the strength it has, and especially in New York, where all the wickedness in newspaperdom is concentrated and consolidated.

Yes, the democratic party is growing because democratic sentiment is growing; our party's policies are growing, and its principles are becoming more widely accepted.

Tariff reform is growing. I have been advocating tariff reform now for thirty-one years and more upon the stump. I have never seen so much tariff reform sentiment as we have today. Governor Dix is right in speaking of its overwhelming character, and yet Governor Wilson is right also when he tells you that we talk in vain about tariff reform or anything else as long as concentrated wealth prevents the people having what they want. Why fight in the valley, unprotected, while the predatory interests have their big guns upon the hills of privilege?

There has not been a campaign in which I have been a candidate in which I did not have on my side the earnest desire of a majority of the people. Why was I not elected? Because the money trust had a strangle grasp upon the American people and they dared not vote for their own relief. That is the situation, my friends. I am as much a tariff reformer as anyone, and yet, although I spoke in congress against the principle of protection, and denounced its constitutionality, when I became a candidate, I found that there was an interest stronger than the interest back of tariff reform and that conspicuous tariff reformers marched behind the banner of the high priest of protection. And so it will be today. You can make your tariff platform what you want, but unless we are strong enough to defeat the bandits and

pirates of finance we can not win this election.

We are making progress on the trust question. When the democrats first talked about putting a trust magnate in the penitentiary we were called disturbers of the peace; we were accused of being jealous of the rich, envious of those having means, but our trusts grew until finally Mr. Taft said, four years ago, that it might be a good thing to put ONE OR TWO of them in the penitentiary. That was a great concession, but, my friends, while at that time we might put one or two in as an experiment, now we indict them by groups. The public sentiment now is that a big criminal is no better than a little one. We have not, I think, put any in the penitentiary yet, but we must have patience. We have made much progress—to get them into court is a great step in advance. And so I might go on. Everything our party stands for and has stood for is growing and has grown, and how can this but help us in our fight?

And we have another advantage, namely, that our opponents are divided. I hope they will not begrudge us the satisfaction we get. We have had so much fighting in our party that they ought to let us for once look on. Republicans have had to come to our conventions for excitement and they have never been disappointed, but now I am afraid, from the present outlook, that their convention is going to be so much more exciting than any of ours has ever been, that no republican will have nervous strength left to come to our convention. And maybe you think I am not getting some satisfaction out of the present condition. I suspected four years ago that the people were making a mistake when they elected Mr. Taft. (Great laughter.) I even intimated it to some close friends. Now I know it. I have Mr. Roosevelt's testimony (laughter) and who could tell better than he whether his man had failed or not. The mere announcement of his candidacy is a declaration that Mr. Taft has failed.

He nominated Mr. Taft and then he elected him. He guaranteed him. He said, "Here's the best prepared man who ever ran for president. I know him like a book. He is city-broke and halter-wise—I can lead him anywhere." Now, as I understand law—there are lawyers here who have had more experience than I have—but as I understand the law, you can not call on a guarantor except in case of insolvency of the principal, and when Mr. Roosevelt comes in and delivers the principal and says that he will now do the work himself, it is a declaration that Mr. Taft is politically bankrupt.

Mr. Roosevelt declares that Mr. Taft ought not to be renominated, and if we can get a dictagraph into the White house we will be able to prove that Mr. Taft believes Mr. Roosevelt ought not to be, and as I have been beaten by both I have to respect the judgment of both and I believe they are both right. I know both of these men. I do not know Mr. Taft as well as Mr. Roosevelt THOUGHT he did and I do not know Mr. Roosevelt as well as Mr. Taft will before he gets through, but I have more than a casual acquaintance with both of them and I know enough about their experiences to know that if they will tell what they know about each other fiction will be set aside for two months for lack of interest in it.

Now, we are in a very fortunate position. We do not care which they nominate for each has destroyed the other. If they nominate Mr. Taft we have this indictment that Mr. Roosevelt has brought against his administration and it can not be withdrawn, no matter what Mr. Roosevelt may do; and we have, besides that, the record that would be enough if we did not have Mr. Roosevelt's indictment. We can show that Mr. Taft's administration, in one respect, has been without a parallel in our history. We can show that there will be, and there is, I think, no doubt about it—three great reforms secured during his administration, to not one of which has he contributed. Find, if you can, another administration in our history where three such reforms came without the president's aid. What are they? First, the election of senators by the people. Mr. Taft said in 1908, that, PERSONALLY, he was in favor of the election of senators by the people themselves—personally inclined to favor it. I pointed out then that personal inclination was not enough, but he was elected, and I was so much more interested in having this reform secured than I was in the name of the man or party through whom it came that I wrote to the man who defeated me and urged him to send a message to congress favoring this amendment, but he wrote back saying that there was a division of sentiment on the subject and that the initia-

tive ought to come from congress. He sat still while the people marched past him and now we do not care what he inclines to favor. We shall get both without him, and when this reform is secured and has made his administration conspicuous in history he will deserve no credit for it. We have secured the purification of politics without his aid. He said in 1908 that we ought not to have publicity until after election. We got it before and he never said a word to help the measure. We are going to have the income tax also. It has been ratified by some thirty-one states and there will be enough more soon to ratify it, but this man who used the amendment in order to defeat a statutory income tax, has never said a word since then in its behalf. He has travelled over the country at public expense, he has talked on all other subjects, but he has never said a word in favor of its ratification. He elevated to the position of associate justice of the supreme court a governor of your own state who asked the legislature not to ratify it. Three reforms are coming and he will have no part in them. No wonder Mr. Roosevelt calls his administration a failure. No wonder progressive republicans call it a failure. No wonder, in the great state of Illinois, Mr. Taft was repudiated by an overwhelming majority by his own party. Up in North Dakota he got only fifteen hundred votes out of fifty thousand cast for his party.

But suppose they nominate Mr. Roosevelt instead of Mr. Taft? Will our party then disband? Not for a moment. If they nominate Mr. Roosevelt, his nomination will be an indictment of the republican party, while his candidacy was merely an indictment against Mr. Taft, for if they nominate him it will be on the theory that he is the only man who can save his party from defeat.

Think of it! Sixty years of history and nearly all that time in absolute control of the government, and yet that coming into power four years ago with a majority of over a million has so disappointed the people that not only the president can not be re-elected, but no other republican except Mr. Roosevelt has the confidence of the American people! Is it not a humiliating confession?

But that's not all. To nominate Mr. Roosevelt they must ignore the precedent of a century; and let no one think that the objection to a third term can be dissolved in a cup of coffee. I have seen a good many foolish things in papers but I will offer a prize for anything more foolish than the "Outlook" editorial on the coffee habit. Do you remember how it settled this great constitutional question? It was like this: If you ask a man to have another cup of coffee and he says no, thank you, I won't have any more, it does not mean he will not take any more at NOON or the NEXT DAY, but only NOT AT THIS MEAL. How easily disposed of. Mr. Roosevelt ought to tell us whether the two-cup habit applies to dinner as well as to breakfast. Can a man go to Africa and come back and take two more cups? Or can he take the whole pot of coffee at noon? He is young yet, can he go to Africa again and come back for supper and take two more cups. Don't you think we have a right to know what precedent is to be established? Senator Beveridge said in Indianapolis recently, that Roosevelt ought to be elected, "if for no other reason than to do away with this silly anti-third term sentiment. It was not silly when Washington established it; it was not silly when Jefferson indorsed it; it has not seemed silly to those who followed it and to those who were not willing to give it to Grant, the general of the successful armies in the civil war. Is it not, my friends, something more than a silly sentiment? If I understand the trend of affairs, the tendency is to limit executives to one term, not to extend their time to three terms. How do I know? Because our state constitutions are making the governor ineligible to re-election. Why? Because of the power he has in his hands; because of the influence he exerts; it is to take him from the temptation to use it for his own advantage. If that is a good reason why the governor should not hold office more than one term, is it not a better reason why the president should not hold it more than one term? The president has more power in his hands than any other human being, more than any king, emperor, or czar. Their subjects would not dare to trust an hereditary ruler with the power the president has. Our president has under him hundreds of thousands of people whose salaries he can stop in a moment. Not only that. He is commander-in-chief of the army and navy. No battleship can turn its prow to the ocean without his command and no soldier wearing the uniform of